

| | | |
|--|----------------|-----------------------|
| REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION AFTER FINAL | Application # | 10/682,372 |
| | Confirmation # | 6095 |
| | Filing Date | October 10, 2003 |
| | First Inventor | OLLMAR |
| | Art Unit | 3735 |
| | Examiner | Natnithithadha, Navin |
| | Docket # | P08079US01/BAS |

Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

S I R:

In response to the final Office Action dated April 22, 2008, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner reconsider the rejections and find all claims allowable based on the discussion which follows.

Claims 14-17 and 19-43 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Davies (U.S. Patent No. 6,922,486) (hereinafter "Davies") in view of Sieburg (U.S. Patent No. 7,103,398) (hereinafter "Sieburg").

Contrary to the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection, the present invention is not obvious from Davies in view of Sieburg, as the combination, *arguendo*, fails to teach each and every element claimed. Moreover, there fails to be any reasonably apparent reason why one of ordinary skill in the art would have selected various elements from Davies and Sieburg to arrive at the claimed invention. Furthermore, even if one would have combined the elements, as alleged, one would not be enabled to practice the invention as claimed. The combination of elements do not perform in a predictable manner for the prior art to allow one to use the invention claimed as a diagnostic tool. Therefore, there would have been no incentive for one to combine the references.

The present invention, as recited in claim 14, is directed to a novel and non-obvious method for diagnosing a diseased condition of skin and claim 30 is directed